REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above identified application in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8, and added Claim 15.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,549,240 to Reitmeier.

Reitmeier discloses a format and frame rate conversion for display of 24Hz source video within the context of a digital television. The digital television has a video processing section including a video decoder 120. The video decoder 120 receives a video stream S2 in a standard manner and produces a decoded video signal S4 having a given transmission format and frame rate. A vertical resizer 140 and a horizontal resizer 150 are used to convert the picture format. The resized and de-interlaced signal is fed into a frame buffer 160 for storing the video information. A controller 200 generates read and write signals so that the processing of the components is properly synchronized (see col. 6, lines 42-58).

Further, the frame buffer 160 of Reitmeier includes an input frame store buffer 162 and an output frame store buffer 164 that act in combination to increase the frame rate of a video signal. The frame buffer 160 accomplishes the increase in frame rate by functionally swapping the input frame store buffer 162 and the output frame store buffer 164 (see col. 5, lines 35-38). Neither component buffer 162 nor 164 individually receives a video signal as an input to produce an increased frame rate video signal as an output. In short, the component buffers 162, 164 act together as an internal memory for frame buffer 160. Neither the video decoder 120 nor any other component of Reitmeier accesses the internal components of the

frame buffer 160 for storing picture data.

The subject claims are not rendered obvious by the Reitmeier. In particular, there is nothing in Reitmeier that discloses or suggests, in whole or in part, the signal processing unit defined by Claim 1 of the subject application. In particular, there is nothing in Reitmeier which discloses or suggests, a signal processing unit for a digital TV system including a first device which acts on a video signal with graphical picture elements and text characters to produce a first device output video signal, a second device which converts a frame rate of the first device output video signal to produce an increased frame rate video signal, a picture storage device accessed by the first and second devices during processing of the video signal and first device output video signal, respectively, for storing and retrieving picture data for the first and second devices, and a driver stage which drives a display responsive to the increased frame rate video signal. Reitmeier does not disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, such a second device that produces an increased frame rate video signal and uses the same picture storage device as another component. It is black letter law that it is impermissible for the Examiner to read teachings into references which are simply not there. Consequently, Claim 1 and each of the remaining claims depending therefrom are not rendered obvious by the reference cited by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claim 8, there is nothing in Reitmeier that discloses or suggests, in whole or in part, the method defined by Claim 8 of the subject application. In particular, there is nothing in Reitmeier which discloses or suggests, a method for processing a digital TV system signal including the steps of acting by a first device on an input video signal with graphical picture elements and text characters to produce a processed video signal,

_700634_1/

wherein the first device stores and retrieves picture data from a common storage device, increasing by a second device the frame rate of the processed video signal to produce an increased frame rate video signal, wherein the second device stores and retrieves picture data from the common storage device and driving a display responsive to the increased frame rate video signal. As a result, circuitry for storing pictures for the first and second devices is reduced because the common storage device is utilized by the first and second devices. Reitmeier does not have such methodology. Rather, Reitmeier simply uses a frame buffer to increase the frame rate without allowing the memory components to be accessed by any other component for any other purpose. In view of this, Claim 8 and each of the remaining claims depending therefrom are not rendered obvious by the reference cited by the Examiner, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants have added new Claim 15 which is directed to additional patentable aspects of the subject disclosure. All of the limitations of new independent Claim 15 are comparable to a limitation of pending claims and, as a result, no additional searching is believed to be required. Applicants respectfully submit that new Claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the art of record because it recites, *inter alia*, a common storage device for storing and retrieving picture data, a first device that stores and retrieves picture data from the common storage device and a second device for increasing a frame rate of the processed video signal, wherein the second device stores and retrieves picture data from the common storage device. According, allowance Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present

paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 04-1105. It is respectfully submitted that all of

the claims now remaining in this application are in condition for allowance, and such action

is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone

interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned

attorney may be contacted at the number set forth herein below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2005

George Chaclas

George N. Chaclas, Reg. No. 46,608
Edwards & Angell LLP
Attorney for Applicants
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205-5874
Tel: (401) 276-6653
Fax: (888) 325-1684